



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

SP
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/080,478	02/22/2002	Siani Lynne Pearson	B-4519 619565-9	8516

7590 08/10/2005

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

PATEL, NIRAV B

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2135

DATE MAILED: 08/10/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/080,478	PEARSON ET AL.
	Examiner Nirav Patel	Art Unit 2135

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 February 2002.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 22 February 2002 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date (6) 12/08/03

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the application filed on 2/22/2002.
2. Claims 1-10 are under examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1-5, 8, 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Sipman et al (US 6,889,325).

As per claim 1, Sipman discloses:

selecting a user within the trusted computing environment [col. 5 lines 29-37 “a party 12, 13 will be registered to be able to participate in the transaction system. In Step A the party 12, 13 fills in an application form, containing his request to participate in the transaction system (i.e. selecting a user from list), his identification and (if payment is included in his profile) a list of payment methods (which cards, debit or credit, etc.) he wants to use (if he is a payer/consumer 12)

or a list of payment accepting methods (which accounts, etc.) he wants to use (if he is a supplier 13”];

creating an investigation identity which is owned by the user [col. 5 lines 52-60 “if the Registration Authority 10 of the party 12, 13 verifies the party positively, i.e. party's identity and other information match, it sends an approval message (step C) to the organisation operating the transaction server 11. Using the approval message content of Step C in the transaction server 11 a profile for the party will be built, Step D. Each profile contains at least the party's identification and those other data, which are required to process the transactions as being used”, col. 6 lines 16-17 “The content of this package (data, program and token) mirrors the profile” Fig. 2 step E (send data, Program and Token to party)];

using the investigation identity to take part in transactions [col. 5 lines 58-60 “Each profile contains at least the party's identification and those other data, which are required to process the transactions as being used”] ; and

creating a record of those transactions [col.8 lines 10-11 “the server may log the full transaction details”].

As per claim 2, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and further Sipman discloses:

the investigation identity is an anonymous identity [col. 5 lines 65-67 “the profile may contain cryptographic keys, to enhance the security of the communication between the transaction server and the party”, col. 6 lines 1-2 “the profile may

contain a random data string, which acts as a pseudonym for the party identified”].

As per claim 3, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and further Sipman discloses:

transactions made using the investigation identity are kept in an authenticated record by a trusted party **[col. 6 lines 30-33 “the transaction server 20 processes the transactions, after thorough verification of the validity of the transaction, using the party’s profiles, as stored in the transaction server 20”, col. 8 lines 10-11 “the server may log the full transaction details”].**

As per claim 4, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and further Sipman discloses:

the record of transactions is made available to an investigator **[col. 8 lines 10-12 “the server may log the full transaction details, to be collected by the first party (i.e. investigator) at a later time”].**

As per claim 5, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and further Sipman discloses:

the investigation identity is used by an investigator who takes part in the transactions **[col. 5 lines 58-60 “ each profile contains at least the party’s identification (i.e.**

investigation identity) **and those other data, which are required to process the transactions as being used”].**

As per claim 8, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and further Sipman discloses:

the trusted computing environment includes a trusted party who maintains the identities of parties to a transaction **[col. 5 lines 16-17 “the transaction server holds so-called profiles 7 and 8 (i.e. identities) for the participating parties”]** such that the identity of each party can be authenticated by other parties **[col. 3 lines 8-11 “each profile comprising a party identifier identifying the party, and authentication data for authenticating the party” col. 3 lines 21-22 “the transaction server verifying the authenticity of the second party”]** whilst each party is anonymous to the other parties **[col. 6 lines 1-2 “the profile may contain a random data string, which acts as a pseudonym for the party identified”].**

As per claim 9, Sipman discloses:

a trusted computing device arranged such that an investigation identity is owned by a user **[col. 5 lines 58-59 “each profile contains at least the party’s identification”** **col. 6 lines 16-17 “the content of this package (date, program and token) mirrors the profile”, Fig. 2 step E (send data, Program and Token to party)],** and a record of transactions made by the investigation identity is stored in an authenticated record by

the trusted computing device [col. 8 lines 10-11 “the server may log the full transaction details”].

As per claim 10, it is a computer program product claim corresponds to method claim 1 and is rejected for the same reason set forth in the rejection of claim 1 above [Sipman discloses the computer program in claim 8 line 1, col. 15 line 5].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sipman et al (US 6,889,325), and further in view of Porcaro (US 5,774,717).

As per claim 6, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and Sipman doesn't teach the *user can monitor the transactions* made using the investigation identity.

However, Porcaro discloses that the *user can monitor the transactions* [col. 3 lines 63-65 “Fig. 3 depicts the Transaction Replay Status panel that allows the user to monitor the status”]

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Porcaro into the teaching of Sipman to allow the user for monitoring the transaction status. The modification would be obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to utilize the panel so that the user can monitor the progress and status of transaction and quickly resolve any conflict [**Porcaro col. 2 lines 29-30**].

As per claim 7, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and further Sipman doesn't teach that the user can inhibit the operation of the investigation identity.

However, Porcaro implies that user can control all aspects (i.e. including the operation of the investigation identity) [**col. 3 lines 64-65**].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Porcaro into the teaching of Sipman to control the operation of the investigation identity by the user. The modification would be obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to utilize the panel so that the user can quickly resolve any conflict [**Porcaro col. 2 lines 29-30**].

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Wheeler et al (US 6,789,189) discloses a method of managing account in a database in an ABDS system including recording information pertaining to each of the accounts in the database.

Dickinson et al (US 6,853,988) discloses a cryptographic server providing interoperability over multiple algorithm keys, standards, certificate types and issuers, protocols, and the like.

England (US 6,757,824) teaches the computer operating systems and more particularly to verifying components loaded by an operating system.

Helbig Sr (US 5,841,868) --- Trusted Computer System.

Megiddo (US 6,725,269) teaches that allows a single user to maintain on the user's personal machine multiple identities for browsing on the Internet.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nirav Patel whose telephone number is 571-272-5936. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 am - 4:30 pm (M-F).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Vu can be reached on 571-272-3859. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

NBP

7/28/05



KIM VU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100